

Serial No. 09/788,473

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-5 were previously pending and under consideration.

Claims 6-10 are added herein.

Therefore, claims 1-10 are now pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-5 are rejected.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended herein.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

In the Office Action, at page 2, the drawings were objected to. In view of the accompanying separate Letter to the Examiner Requesting Approval of Changes to the Drawings, the outstanding drawing objection is resolved. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

CHANGES TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been reviewed in response to this Office Action. Changes have been made to the specification only to place it in preferred and better U.S. form for issuance and to resolve the Examiner's objections raised in the Office Action. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 2-4, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Guck in view of Kennedy. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1, for example, recites a client apparatus using a condition to form a group of electronic mails and a title of at least one such mail is displayed. The electronic mails in the

Serial No. 09/788,473

group are sorted into a hierarchical structure according to subordinate relations between the electronic mails in the group. Indicia of one of the sorted mails is displayed.

Guck discusses a system for storing messages in transport-independent form within an object database. The purpose of Guck is to allow incompatible clients or tools to share messages. Guck does not disclose or suggest a client apparatus forming a group of electronic mails from among preciously transmitted or received electronic mails.

Kennedy discusses a system for remote access to e-mail that was transmitted or received by other means. That is to say, a client uses a protocol such as IMAP to obtain from a server information about e-mail stored on the server and to upload and download e-mail messages. The features of Kennedy do not significantly relate to actual e-mail transmission by a client, which one skilled in the art will understand to be different than uploading or downloading e-mail. Transmission of e-mail messages sends a message to its destination. Uploading or downloading is usually used for client-server message synchronization. Furthermore, Kennedy does not display electronic mails transmitted from the clients.

Neither reference, alone or combined, discloses or suggests electronic mails, as qualified above (e.g. from among transmitted mails), where the mails in the hierarchy are hierarchically related according to subordinate relations therebetween.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 6 recites displaying hierarchically related electronic mails in the form of a tree. None of the prior art references discuss or suggest a tree of a group of messages, with the tree displaying subordinate relations between its messages.

New claim 7 recites an aspect of the invention in which subordinate or hierarchical relations in the hierarchy reflect reply/forwarding relations between like-titled messages. Previously, users could forward and reply to messages but could not later tell which messages were replies or forwardings of which other messages, in particular when the messages had a substantively same title (e.g. "want to see a movie?", and "Re: want to see a movie?", and perhaps many other messages with the latter title).

New claim 8 recites forming a hierarchy of mutually related e-mail messages based on information indicating which messages were sent as replies-to or forwardings-of other messages in the hierarchy. A tree structure is displayed that corresponds to the hierarchy, and the tree shows which messages were sent as replies-to or forwardings-of which

Serial No. 09/788,473

respective other messages in the hierarchy.

Claim 9 recites in effect that the messages get older further down the hierarchy.

New claim 10 recites that messages in the hierarchy are mutually related by a same substantive title.

The features of claims 6-10 are not taught or suggested by the prior art.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, claim 3 recites using headers of the mails to perform the sorting. This feature is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 16 OCT 2004

By: James T. Strom

James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on October 18, 2004
By: James T. Strom
Date: October 18, 2004

10